1 2 3 4 5 6	Law Offices of David P. Gardner David P. Gardner, Esq. (SBN 123787) 755 Baywood Drive, 2 nd Floor Petaluma, CA 94954 Telephone: (707) 774-3085 Facsimile: (707) 665-5291 Attorney for Debtors/Plaintiffs					
8	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT					
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	SANTA ROSA DIVISION					
11	In re					
12	GARRET ALLAN MOORE SUSAN MARIE MOORE,) Chapter 13 Case No. 11–13325				
13	Debtors.					
14))				
15	GARRET ALLAN MOORE SUSAN MARIE MOORE,	Adversary Proceeding No. 13–1174				
16	Plaintiffs,)) 				
17	VS.	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT TO DETERMINE DISCHARGEABILITY OF A CERTAIN DEBT AS A MEDICAL LOAN AND NOT A STUDENT LOAN				
18 19	ACS EDUCATION SERVICES, KEYBANK, N.A., NCO FINANCIAL, and NATIONAL					
20	COLLEGIATE STUDENT LOAN TRUST 2003-1)))				
21	Defendants.					
22						
23						
24	Plaintiffs Garret Allan Moore and Susan Marie Moore ("Plaintiffs"), allege as follows:					
25	JURISDICTION & VENUE					
26	1. This adversary proceeding is one arising in the Chapter 13 case of Plaintiffs, Case					
27	Number 11–13325, now pending in this Court. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §					
28	151, 157, 1334.					
	1					
Cas	Case: 13-01174 Doc# 4 Filed: 03/06/14 Entered: 03/06/14 12:10:40 Page 1 of 5					

2.	This Adversary Proceeding is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(B)(2)(F
is brought und	er 11 U.S.C. §§523(a)(8)(A)(I), 523(a)(8)(A)(ii), 523(a)(8)(B) & FRBP Rule 7001(2)

3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1409(a).

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 4. On August 31, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a Voluntary Petition for relief under Chapter 13. David Burchard is the duly appointed and acting Trustee.
- 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendant ACS ("Defendant ACS") is a business entity with a principal place of business outside the State of California, conducting business as a lender in the State of California.
- 6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendant KeyBank, N.A. ("Defendant KeyBank") is a business entity with a principal place of business outside the State of California, conducting business as a lender in the State of California.
- 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendant NCO Financial Services, Inc. ("Defendant NCO") is a business entity with a principal place of business in California, conducting business as a debt collector in the State of California.
- 8. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendant National Collegiate Student Loan Trust 2003-1 ("Defendant Trust") is a business entity, form unknown, doing business in the State of California.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF [11 U.S.C. §523(a)(8)(A)(I), 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(8)(A)(ii), 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(8)(B)]

- 9. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 8 as if fully set forth herein.
- 10. On or about 08/04/2003 Plaintiffs entered into a loan agreement with defendant ACS, pursuant to which defendant ACS loaned Plaintiffs \$58,534.72 for the purpose of paying for their son's residential medical treatment and drug rehabilitation program (the "ACS Loan").
- 11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant KeyBank and Defendant NCO claim some right, title or interest in ownership and/or repayment of the ACS Loan.

28 ///

- 12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at some point the ACS Loan was sold, assigned and/or otherwise transferred to Defendant Trust, and that Defendant Trust claims some right, title or interest in ownership and/or repayment of the ACS Loan.
- 13. When Plaintiffs inquired about obtaining the ACS Loan, Plaintiffs were told that the Loan was a medical "Achiever Loan" loan, and that the ACS Loan was tax-deductible as a medical expense. Plaintiffs in fact took a medical expense deduction from their taxes for the ACS Loan. Plaintiffs were never told that the ACS Loan was a student loan.
- 14. The ACS Loan was for the purpose of the medical care of the Debtors' dependent son and was tax-deductible as such pursuant to IRC section 213(a).
- 15. Plaintiffs attempted to consolidate the ACS loan, but were declined because the loan was a private money loan and not federally guaranteed.
- 16. The ACS Loan from Defendant ACS to Plaintiffs was not a non-dischargeable student loan within the meaning of:
 - a. 11 U.S.C. sec. 523(a)(8)(A)(i), in that the Loans are not insured or guaranteed by a governmental unit, or made under any program funded in whole or in part by a governmental unit or nonprofit institution;
 - b. 11 U.S.C. sec. 523 (a)(8)(A)(ii), in that the Loans are not an obligation to repay funds received as an educational benefit, scholarship or stipend;
 - c. 11 U.S.C. sec. 523(a)(8)(B), in that the Loans are not "qualified education loans" within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code 28 USC sec. 221(d)(1).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as set forth below.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraudulent Inducement

- 17. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 16 set forth above.
- 18. Defendants intentionally and deliberately misrepresented that the ACS loan was a medical "Achiever Loan" and not a student loan.

1	6. (Granting Plaintiffs such other	er relief as is just and proper.
2			
3	Dated: March 6,	, 2014	/s/ David P. Gardner David P. Gardner, Esq. Attorney for Debtors/Plaintiffs
4			Attorney for Debtors/Plaintiffs
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			